DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 095 RC 009 394

TITLE	Evaluation Report of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective -- School Management Options Available to Indian People. Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 29.08.
INSTITUTION	National Indian Training and Research Center, Tempe, Ariz.; Underwood Research and Evaluation, Tulsa, Okla.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Indian Affairs (Dept. of Interior), Albuquerque, N. Mex.
PUB DATE	Apr 76
NOTE	95p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; Change Strategies; *Educational Alternatives; Information Dissemination; Interagency Coordination; Management by Objectives; Objectives; Planning; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *School District Autonomy; Self Actualization
IDENTIFIERS	BIA; *Bureau of Indian Affairs; *Presidential Secretarial Objective

ABSTRACT

Presenting evaluations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) implementation of the School Management Option Project, a project designed to further American Indian control of schools and elevated to the status of Presidential/Secretarial Objective (P/SO) in 1974, this report includes separate evaluations by the National Indian Training and Research Center (NITRC) and Underwood Research and Evaluation made between June 1974 and December 1975. The NITRC evaluation presents a summary of findings, recommendations for future BIA strategy, comments on specific Area Offices, and an appendix. Among the NITRC recommendations presented are: all future P/SO should be carefully coordinated with all other BIA efforts in information dissemination re: PL 93-638; the fact that PL 93-638 provides for contracting partial and special programs should be emphasized; the public school option should be kept viable and in no way played down. The Underwood evaluation is presented by area as it is based on interviews and site visits to Indian schools in the Aberdeen, Muskogee, Anadarko, and Eastern Areas and assesses the effectiveness of BIA information dissemination re school management options. Among the Underwood recommendations are: the training packet should be mandatory; individual Areas must specify to the Central Office who is responsible for information dissemination and who constitutes the target audiences; there should be a Central-Area agreement on priorities. (JC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED127096

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION REPORT SERIES NO. 29.08

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVE, SCHOOL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO INDIAN PEOPLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PREPARED FOR:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
INDIAN EDUCATION RESOURCES CENTER
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103

BY:

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER
2121 SOUTH MILL AVENUE, SUITE 204
TEMPE, ARIZONA 85282

AND

UNDERWOOD RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
5963 EAST 31ST STREET
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74135

CE020093 94

THOMAS KLEPPE, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

MORRIS THOMPSON, COMMISSIONER
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

WILLIAM DEMMERT, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

WILLIAM J. BENHAM, ADMINISTRATOR
INDIAN EDUCATION RESOURCES CENTER
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

THOMAS R. HOPKINS, CHIEF
DIVISION OF EVALUATION, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

LYLE G. ELTON, PROJECT COORDINATOR
DIVISION OF EVALUATION, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

APRIL 1976

CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

SECTION II: NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER REPORT

SECTION III: UNDERWOOD RESEARCH AND EVALUATION REPORT

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

In May 1974, the Education Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs embarked on a specific project related to Indian control of schools. This particular project was designated by the Secretary of Interior as the Bureau's primary education objective for FY 1975. The project's priority for implementation was enhanced when in November 1974 it was elevated to the status of "Presidential Objectives." The Objective states:

> By the end of FY 1975, in at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau Schools, by official action of a tribal or Alaskan village government, a choice of the Management System will be made by those served by the schools.

The School Management Options Project has been given further support and reinforcement through the enactment of Law Bill S. 1017 which became Public Law 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act. It is through this policy of Indian self-determination that the School Management Options Project has been developed and implemented.

Project development included the need for an outside Agency to monitor the Bureau's progress in implementing the Objective. This evaluation project was intended to review the approaches and policies of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective Project and provide the information required for planning and managing future activities of the project.

Contracts were awarded to two Indian Research and Evaluation firms to perform the evaluation. These firms were:

(1) National Indian Training and Research Center, Tempe, Arizona
(2) Underwood Research and Evaluation, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

This report reflects progress on the project which covers the period of June 1974 through December 1975. We believe that each reader will find the report encouraging and will continue to follow the projects progress.

EVALUATION OF PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN EDUCATION

Submitted To:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Indian Education Resources Center
P.O. Box 1788
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Submitted By:

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER

2121 South Mill Avenue Suite 204
Tempe, Arizona 85282
(602) 967-9484

February 13, 1976

FORWARD

This report is based on a summary of field trips, questionaire responses, review of Area and Agency records, and extensive interviews with Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel (IERC, Area and Agency), tribal council members, Indian leaders and affected parents and patrons of BIA schools. Details of much of the information have been reported periodically through interim reports. The attempt in this summary is to analyse and assess what has been happening with particular reference to <u>why</u>. From the data gathered and analysed, recommendations are made for the overall consideration of management.

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Indian Affairs employs a systems approach to management which is referred to as management by objectives (MBO). A chief objective under this system, which was accepted at the Secretarial and Presidential levels of Government and became known as the Presidential/Secretarial Objectives (P/SO), reads as follows:

> "By the end of FY 1975, in at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau schools, by official action of a Tribal or Alaskan Village Government, a choice of the Management System will be made by those served by the schools."

This objective has carried over to the FY 1976 with some apparent modification in the offering.

The participation of the National Indian Training and Research Center (NITRC) in the evaluation of this program has been made under a contract with the BIA involving P/SO activity in the Albuquerque, Juneau, Navajo, Phoenix, Portland Areas, and Central Office.

This report is organized to present a summary of the findings and conclusions reached along with recommendations for consideration in overall Bureau strategy for pursuing the presentation of management options to Indian tribes and groups. A brief overview of the BIA Area involvement follows. The Appendix provides a critique of the slide-tapes and copies of the various instruments developed for interview guides and data gathering.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions reached and discussed here are interrelated and, in many instances, overlapping. They are discussed separately in the interest of clarity.

1. There is almost, if not total acceptance or total interpretation that no decision means a decision.

This interpretation was made or accepted by most Federal employees (all field employees) and appeared to be obvious to Indian informants. To Indian groups this type of decision (no inclination to act formally) seems to mean one of two things: (1) leave the school management as is (under BIA) or (2) wait and see. The overwhelming response to P/SO by tribes was to make no decision at all. The many factors discussed in this report provide the rationale as to why no decisions were made.

2. Decisions or "no decision" decisions are made in context or in relationship to an overriding factor or factors that are, or may be peculiar, to the local group where a BIA school is located.

Casa Blanca community of the Gila River Reservation has just secured a new Federal school. Leaders there showed no interest whatsoever in discussing alternate management approaches. Some Papago communities are urgently seeking new facilities through the BIA. This overshadows any real interest in management options. Arizona Indian leaders are fully aware of the serious funding problems plaguing the Indian related public schools. The fear of future funding in public schools has been mentioned several times; all of which adds up to an overriding deterrant fac-

tor in even discussing the public school option. The prevalent Arizona attitude is to stay with BIA management. Similarly, the funding problems at Rough Rock Contract school are well known.

In Alaska several major factors are affecting consideration of multiple management options; namely, (1) the long history and precedence of public school take over; (2) Alaska legislation in the making which will further regionalize Alaskan areas for public school responsibility (BIA schools included in regional attendance areas); (3) deadline on Alaskan Native Land Settlement which preempts time for other considerations; (4) the fact there is no provision for retrocession in the Alaska P/SO program; and (5) the fear of future funding.

Albuquerque Area made two contracts with two groups (Acoma and IAIA Board) to make needs assessments. While the grants were not directed toward a management decision per se, the grants are related to it and thus introduce new factors - compensation for time, travel, etc.

One school board (Gila Crossing) was preoccupied with getting rid of the principal which preempted time or energy that might have been given to consideration of management options.

The overwhelming factor in the Portland Area, that of getting concurrence from some 30 tribes, is a strong deterrant in securing interest or activity related to management options for the Chemawa School. Only the Warm Springs Indians gave consideration

to an alternate approach to the present arrangement; namely, to maintain the dormitories at Chemawa under BIA management while transfering instructional activities to the local public school.

3. Internal problems, squabbles, and opposing factions and groups within tribes account for much P/SO inactivity.

This is the story at Navajo. The confusion resulting from charges and counter-charges between groups and individuals resulted in the moratorium on all P/SO activity (December, 1974). Research of Navajo records and reports portray all the suspicion, confusion, misunderstanding and divergence of opinions between individuals and groups that characterize the overall findings in this evaluation report.

The Papago Superintendent reports the conflict is largely between the elders who fear change and the young activists who are crusading for change without consideration of the needs and opinions of the majority.

4. The passage of Public Law 93-638, and subsequent activity is confusing the broader options offered under P/SO with the overall result of suspicion, gross misunderstanding and inactivity.

The term, self-determination, is being incredibly linked to both the word and concept expressed by termination. This gross misconception of the intent of self-determination is well documented in reports from all areas. The Chairman of the Arizona Inter-Tribal Council said the people, more than anything else, believed the BIA efforts in P/SO and self-determination activity were

linked to termination (meaning termination of trust land responsibility). The NASBA report on the Navajo pointedly portrays the gross misunderstanding that abounds.

> It is an unfortunate coincidence that the P.S.O., and the powerful expression of it in the Self-Determination Act should arrive from Washington just as the Navajo Tribe is beginning to face the problems which contracting has already caused. Many Navajos are beginning to feel that contracting is being forced upon them, and the badly outnumbered supporters of contracting, (and take-over) are seeking outside encouragement from Washington. The encouragement is coming, in particular from those explaining the Self-Determination Act, and their presentations are further agitating internal tribal conflicts.

Pima reports state that many Indians feel P/SO is an attempt of the BIA to "sell out". One Ute tribal councilman lost his re-election bid because he favored self-determination while his opponent interpreted this to mean termination (reported in The Ute Bulletin, December 23, 1975).

5. The effort of BIA personnel to implement the P/S objective is being interpreted as pressure on the part of Indian groups to act.

Some Indians say we "are being told what to do" and that the implied pressure interferes with planning that was "going on". Employees report they have used gimmicks to secure attendance at meetings. This apparently is being misinterpreted.

6. The most frequent answer given by BIA personnel when asking, Why the problems, misunderstandings, etc.? is "timing is off".

This seems to mean that the impact of the far reaching implications in Self-Determination activity (with the many unanswered

questions) thoroughly preempts any early consideration of management options in Education. One Indian reported to have said, "you told us, now come back in five years for an answer."

7. The lack of responses to questionaires reflect the wait and see attitude which characterizes the lack of any formal action on the vast majority of Indian communities or groups where BIA schools are located.

NITRC forwarded self addressed (stamped) and easy-to-complete questionaires to 70 Indian tribal councilmen in the Phoenix Area and 15 to Indian leaders in the Albuquerque Area. Only 5 responses were received from Phoenix Area and none from the Albuquerque Area. They seem to feel that even requests for information and opinions as a type of pressure which creates apathy, suspicion and no response. Three responses refer to the time factor (much more time needed).

> "It is not feasible at the present to absorb the system wholly."
>
> "No information to tribal council. If and when information is given, the decision-making process will be slow. Change is always slow."
>
> "A learning process from the top level to the grass roots level, and vice versa. To learn the system at all levels before trying to educate people for two to four weeks to accept a system that have been in existance for many years."

8. Neither of NITRC's preconceived hypotheses can be substantiated from the data collected.

NITRC proposed two hypotheses; namely, (1) that the P/S Objective should be implemented primarily through the Area Directors and

Agency Superintendents as the goal is primarily an administrative goal; and (2) that fear of loss of BIA jobs would be a deterring factor to effective promotion of the management options.

The first hypothesis could not be supported by testimony of the reservation superintendents. They felt strongly that P/SO was primarily an education matter and should be handled by education personnel under the overall supervision of the agency superintendents. Agency Superintendents at Pima and Papago are thoroughly knowledgeable of the P/SO activity affecting their agencies.

The second hypothesis cannot be supported although Navajo reports allegations that contracting by the Tribe is aimed at putting BIA employees out of a job (letter of McDonald to Commissioner, Dec. 13, 1974); and rumors reported in school board minutes that the P/SO project was a threat to jobs. The fact that 5,000 Navajos work for the BIA (approximately 1/2 in Education) lends some credence to the hypothesis that BIA jobs held by local Indians is a deterring factor in their influence for change. At Hopi, P/SO was given a low priority of meeting agendas. This is understandable at Hopi since their major concern is the development of a high school under BIA auspices.

9. P/SO planning, enthusiasm and vigorous promotion of the goal wanes as the execution of the program passes from Central Office to Area and on to the Agency levels.

At the Cental Office - IERC level, there is excellent planning, a major effort in the development of training materials (slides, tapes), staff training, feed back processes and provision for

timely reporting. All of this seems to lessen as it passes through the Areas and even more so at the Agency. While there are exceptions in effort the overall appears a valid conclusion.

Some rationale as to why would be the fact that area and agency coordinators have a multiplicity of other duties. P/SO seems to have been "tacked on" as an extra duty. At some agency levels the coordinators are not only met with disinterest but occational distrust and hostility. If nothing else these local attitudes would dampen any enthusiasm. The recommendation might be made that area and agency management place a higher priority of time given by area and local coordinators to the dissemination of management option information.

10. There has been a gradual shift in the use and emphasis of P/SO terminology to the use of such terms as a program of options to Indian communities.

This is found in most area reporting and in interviews with BIA personnel. This appears to be good as it helps to eliminate the concept many Indians feel is implied in "the Government has an objective; we want you to act on it". The Alaskan brochure which we believe is very good, uses the available options approach.

Terminology used plays another important part in presentations to Indian groups. Individuals who reported they had no knowledge of P/SO were familiar with the options, especially contracting and the transfer to public school jurisdiction.

11. Despite the negative findings, there are some concomitant benefits or "spin off" to the program.

Phoenix, Portland and Juneau Areas report the use of the slide-tapes and the request for their use by other organized Indian groups for their general understanding. These auxiliary uses of the pre-packaged materials may prove to be of more worth to the better organized and more experienced groups than to the reservation people for whom they were developed.

12. There were some real innovations made by two areas especially.

The Albuquerque Area grants for needs surveys is a novel approach. The Juneau Area brochure which was given wide circulation, is both innovative and at the same time follows a widely used and accepted method of disseminating information.

13. The reaction to the prepared slides and tapes ranges from very good to being "turned off".

Despite the vigorous efforts of BIA area and some agency personnel, NITRC estimates that most Indian leaders have not seen the slide-tape materials in the prepared training packet. Based on interview follow ups there was no interest shown to view them. Meaningful statistical data could not be found in the reports. Groups, viewing one or two of the presentations in a single meeting, generally indicated an interest to see more but somehow never got around to arranging for follow up presentations.

The inability of NITRC to find a live Indian audience to evaluate reactions to the training packet is one of the limitations of the study. Notwithstanding, a critique of the training packet was made and is given in the Appendix.

Why the wide range of responses to the use made of slide-tapes? The generally favorable reactions to the Navajo response which said, "tapes and film strips ... in their complexity actually confuse the questions which are basic to various alternatives," may be interpreted in context with such factors as, (1) the degree of experience and sophistication of the group; (2) the extent that other local overriding factors were their main focus of attention; and (3) the basic unreadiness of the group to take the first steps in cohesive planning. The No. 2 tape presentation on needs assessment introduces a new element that is different from the options, choices and a decision on management that is promoted through the other seven presentations. This might be the principal "confuser" to some audiences.

14. There appears to be an unfavorable element of control in any MBO objective that emanates from top administration and which seeks an action by Indian people who had no part in the goal development.

It seems to NITRC that management by objectives is successful when top administration has the control in a well integrated program. However, when the element of "control" reaches Indian people, it becomes a liability and creates resistance to any action.

Since 1966 (Rough Rock), Indian people have become increasingly aware of the contract option and a much longer time of the public school option. P/SO comes along and is "plugged in" to an ongoing program with some new terminology and haste, if not pressure for action. A year following, P.L. 93-638 enters the "picture"

with far reaching implications to Indian people and their local government.

The results found in the survey are generally apathy, disinterest, confusion and misunderstanding of the motives behind P/SO. Only a few Indian groups were far enough along in their thinking and local planning to make a decision. Most of the people prefer to wait and see.

15. Finally, factors inherent in the tribal situations and the program at this point in time account for the lack of formal responses.

While the interest and activity at the Area and agency levels varied in presenting the P/S objective, the "fault" cannot be laid to administrative management and direction or lack of it. We have no reason to believe that more detailed planning, more personnel involved, higher priority on time given, better tools for presenting the options, or more vigorous action, would have yielded any greater results as measured by formal decisions reached.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF OVER-ALL BUREAU STRATEGY

1. First and foremost all future P/SO activity should be most carefully coordinated with all other BIA efforts in disseminating information related to P.L. 93-638.

This is acute, especially as the latter may involve education and the schools. We cannot overstress the importance of the overriding factor of limitation of funds mandated by P.L. 93-638 when schools are contracted for operation by tribes or tribal groups. This fund limitation should be thoroughly clarified to Indian groups, otherwise planning may proceed out of context with the most basic factor. Unless this is done, the result will be further confusion and disillusionment.

2. Because P.L. 93-638 provides for contracting of partial and special programs, this fact should be stressed when the contract option in Education is being considered.

It will cost more for an Indian tribe or group to take over the operation of an on-going Federal school unless the BIA auxiliary costs for recruitment, purchasing, personnel, bookkeeping, auditing, supervision, etc. are computed generously in determining overall actual Federal costs for the tribal contract purposes. When the cost facts are known it may be much more feasible for the tribe or group to contract for meal service, transportation, Titled programs, dorm operations or some other partial or special program within the confines of the imposed fund limitation. Insurance alone is a large factor in any contract involving takeover of buildings and equipment.

3. The public school option should be kept viable and in no way "played down" in presenting P.L. 93-638 information.

The pattern of public education in this country is through local public schools operated through the state government processes. Reservation public schools are being given increasing support by Indians. One Indian, during the course of this study, expressed these thoughts: Why should we be different? Why can't we take for granted the kinds of services provided other citizens? Why do we have to decide these things?

4. All references to BIA objectives, even P/SO, should be played down, restated or eliminated entirely in the disseminating of information on options in school or program management.

An acceptable objective to Indian people would seem to be toward greater effort in disseminating depth information that leads to greater understanding of the options available in school management. Based on Indian reactions uncovered in the survey, the latter should not denote an action on their part, even a decision.

5. The BIA should change its reporting system to reflect "no formal decision" made as a decision to remain as is at this point in time.

Once the BIA has given any local group adequate opportunity to be knowledgeable of the management options, this objective should be considered met. Any formal recognition of the decision made

should be required only in connection with any change in management the tribe may propose. A letter of intent from the local group involved would be far more practical to seek than a formal resolution from the tribe.

AREA COMMENTS

Albuquerque Area

The Albuquerque Area operates 11 day schools and 3 boarding schools. The day schools serve the Pueblo communities where the schools are located. One boarding school (Albuquerque) principally serves the Pueblo and Navajo Indian groups within the Area jurisdiction. The other boarding schools (IAIA and SIPI) enroll students from all tribes nationwide.

The entire P/SO thrust of the Area has been directed at 4 schools (3 day and 1 boarding school). These are identified in the FY 1975 summary. A presentation was made to all Pueblo Governors a year ago and invitations extended to other school board members and leaders. No further requests for a presentation of the management options program has been received. Only the one Pueblo (Acoma) has made a formal decision (by Resolution). This decision is to remain under BIA management. Other Area findings are discussed in connection with the information given to support the conclusions reached.

It is suggested that all schools be included "on an equal footing" in any future program for providing management option information.

Juneau Area

The Area operates 53 community day schools and two boarding schools. The latter enroll students from all over the Area. The P/SO program focussed on 17 of the day schools. Formal decisions have been reached in 4 of the communities, 3 choosing the public school option and 1 for tribal-private management. However, information pertaining to the options in school management has been supplied to all communities where Federal schools are located.

The extreme isolation factor creates an almost insurmountable problem for purchasing, supply and services for other than the Federal or public school option. Unless the extra-cost factor can be subsidized, complete take-over of schools in most villages is totally unrealistic. Since 1950 there has been a gradual transfer of BIA schools to public school jurisdiction (42 schools).

Navajo Area

The Navajo Area operates 59 schools, 49 of which are boarding schools. Most of these serve more than one Chapter which multi-

plies the problem of getting a uniform decision by the various groups involved with a single boarding school.

The moratorium on presenting the P/SO program has not prevented both individuals and groups from requesting information. The greatest need at this time would appear to be the development of some guidelines for the guidance of the local Area staff. How much information should be given to interested individuals and groups? And in what form? Should the Area coordinator, on request, appear at school board or Chapter meetings for the purpose of disseminating information on the school management options? These questions should be answered. The whole question of the moratorium might be discussed with the new Area Director and the Tribal Chairman.

Portland Area

The Area operates only the one non-reservation boarding school (Chemawa). The school enrolls students from over 30 tribes in the Northwest. The problem of getting a decision is almost nil. Most tribal groups were disinterested in pursuing the matter. Chemawa School has received a planning grant for new facilities. This virtually precludes reaching any other option other than continued BIA management until this construction need is met. One Agency (Western Washington) forwarded 19 questionaires to Indian leaders and received only one response. Continued participation in the P/SO program would appear of no value to management. It is suggested that this Area be dropped from the program.

Phoenix Area

The Phoenix Area operates 14 community day schools, 3 reservation boarding schools and 4 off-reservation boarding schools. All the boarding schools have multi-tribal enrollments except Santa Rosa and Intermountain.

No schools in the Phoenix Area have made a formal decision with reference to the management options. All the deterring factors referred to in the report summary affect the Phoenix Area schools one way or another. There would seem to be little value in pursuing management options in the off-reservation boarding schools which serve many tribes.

Central Office

There seems to be a notion at the top levels of BIA management that tribes are really interested in contracting. We could find virtually no evidence of this in the tribal groups and individuals contacted.

APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL REVIEW OF TAPES

1. Narrative
2. Checklist Design
3. Checklist Summary

TECHNICAL REVIEW OF THE SEVEN TAPE/FILMSTRIPS

As a part of this contract, NITRC agreed to complete a technical review of the seven tape/filmstrips. Drs. Bill and Carolyn Raymond, NITRC consultants with expertise in several areas including product development, reviewed each tape/filmstrip. Dr. Carolyn Raymond, currently Director of Staff Development of Mesa Public Schools, has spent the last ten years in the area of product development and staff training. She spent four years as a professional staff member of the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Research and Development as a product developer in the staff training division. Dr. Bill Raymond has also developed several products, some of which directly relate to Indian Education. His most recent experiences with Indian Education include serving as a technical advisor to an Indian consultant firm in Albuquerque, New Mexico in the development of a series of curriculum units for Indian students. Part of his current responsibilities involve directing a federally funded tutoring project for approximately 900 Indian students. Prior to becoming involved in private consulting work, Dr. Raymond was the Director for Evaluation at the Arizona Department of Education.

The evaluators upon receiving the assignment to evaluate the series designed a technical checklist to be utilized in reviewing each of the seven tape/filmstrips. Each tape/filmstrip was reviewed considering ten major aspects of a developed product:

- product outcomes
- assessment materials and procedures
- reports of previous use and/or fieldtesting
- adequacy and consistency of materials and procedures
- versatility of materials and procedures
- use of sound learning theory in materials and procedures
- content bias
- orientation and training materials and procedures
- reporting materials and procedures
- time and cost considerations

The evaluators had also requested to be invited to actual sites where the tape/filmstrips were being used. It was the evaluators hope that by actually observing participants viewing the tape/filmstrips that they could better judge the series impact and effectiveness. Unfortunately, by the time the evaluators were selected for this assignment, the tribes in the immediate vicinity had either viewed the first one or two tape/filmstrips and had declined to participate further or had rejected even seeing the first of the series. For that reason the evaluators were unable to utilize this approach.

The material that follows is a technical review therefore based upon the instrument designed by the evaluators. The actual instrument follows this narrative with the judgements made regarding each tape/filmstrip. Immediately following is

an overall general summary of the entire series. This approach was selected because it became obvious after viewing the entire series that the original developers primarily used the same development techniques in each individual tape/filmstrip. For that reason, the same strengths and weaknesses from a technical viewpoint tend to be common to all.

AREA ONE: PRODUCT OUTCOMES

The evaluator identified five major subcategories relating to the broad area of product outcomes. These five categories relate to the generally accepted educational practices regarding the preparation of product objectives as well as proper sequencing, appropriativeness to intended audience, relevancy to overall product goal, etc.

Generally speaking, the product objectives were clearly and explicitly stated and under normal circumstances their attainment would be relatively easy to assess. While it is true that the product objectives are clearly stated, it is highly doubtful that the choice of words presented to participants would be the same words that would normally be found in their everyday vocabulary. This is one of the hallmarks of sophisticated product development, i.e., the vocabulary employed to reveal one's objectives are virtually the same as that easily understood by the intended participant. It must be borne in mind that the overall goal of the series is to deliver necessary information for participants to make a decision regarding their

choice of educational governance not to provide them facilitation with new vocabulary words.

In the evaluators' point of view, many of the "en route" product objectives did not relate to the overall goal of the entire tape/filmstrip series. For example, in the first filmstrip the following objective was presented to participants.

> ...Be able to explain what the Central Office of Indian Education programs has to do -- i.e., develop a training package to provide information on school management and to explain the training program to each area office.

One must question how knowing that a training program was to be devised has any relevancy to helping participants make a choice regarding educational governance. Many of the objectives in the series are just not relevant for the desired outcome. In fact much of the content must be questioned as to relevancy.

AREA TWO: ASSESSMENT MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

The second broad area has three subcategories for critique related to assessment materials and procedures included in the product. After reviewing materials presented to the evaluators, there is no evidence which would tend to indicate that an attempt was made to determine what knowledge, if any, participants had regarding current governance of their educational systems, etc. Furthermore, no instruments existed which could be uti-

lized in determining which of the many product objectives were not being accomplished by participants.

Effective instructional training products should include devices or procedures for determining which objectives are being easily accomplished by participants as well as which ones they are experiencing difficulty in achieving or which ones are not being met at all. Only when this type of procedure is available for collecting data can product developers hope to be able to make product modifications leading to a more effective product.

AREA THREE: REPORTS OF PREVIOUS USE

The third broad area which most product technicians believe is necessary before the product is implemented is data regarding the effectiveness of the product prior to full scale use. Lacking from the program was any data relating to previous product usage. Skillful instructors/trainers could make use of such data as to what groups the product had been developed, its effectiveness, etc. The lack of this type of data leads the evaluator to question whether the original draft documents were properly pilot and field tested prior to the full scale implementation.

AREA FOUR: MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- ADEQUACY AND CONSISTENCY

The next three areas are a critique of the materials and procedures. This first area deals with eleven criteria pertaining to the adequacy and consistency of the product. For the

most part, the product does a reasonable job in matching the activities directly to the objectives within each program. Whether or not these activities are the most appropriate is another question. However, those activities selected do appear to be directly related to intended outcomes.

Unfortunately, in the subcategory that rates whether or not the instructional materials are likely to produce adequate participant interest and enthusiasm, the evaluators would have to judge most of the materials as seriously deficient. Some hard evidence is available in that it is the evaluator's understanding that most groups after viewing the first tape/filmstrips, refused to participate in the further viewing of the remaining series.

There are a few pluses for the product in this area. They are convenient and easy to use. They are relatively low in production costs.

But as mentioned earlier, the evaluator questions whether some of the things which were taught really needed to be taught. Those things which were selected to be included in the instructional parts of the program were done in a very skimpy fashion. The product would be vastly improved by eliminating half of the product objectives and providing more information on those retained. In some cases, the transition between the information being presented for one objective does flow smoothly to information being presented for the next objective. However, in many situations this is not the case.

AREA FIVE: MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- VERSATILITY

This area had six subcategories dealing with the versatility of the product. The evaluators would judge this entire area to be weak. The series fails to provide a variety of approaches to deliver the intended information to the participants.

AREA SIX: MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- SOUND LEARNING THEORY

Regarding the incorporation of sound learning theory into the overall product, the evaluator identified ten major subcategories that could be examined to determine whether or not the product met minimum standards.

One subcategory relates to whether or not the product is organized in such a manner so that participants have early knowledge of the purpose of the presentation (revealing objectives) and why it is important for them to obtain the objectives. In this area most of the filmstrips did present the participants the objectives as well as a rationale as to why it was desirable for the objectives to be achieved. Unfortunately, selection of vocabulary was either too technical or too abstract to comprehend for the average person not familiar with the concepts.

Other concerns in this area center around the lack of efficient examples of the concepts that the tape/filmstrips were attempting to teach or those that were provided did not clearly illustrate principles or concepts being described. One widely accepted effective teaching methodogy is actively involving participants. That is to say, the product should be so designed

that opportunities exist for the utilization of activities that require participants to become actively involved rather than passively sit through a series of presentations. In this regard, the tape/filmstrips were quite deficient. It is also generally accepted that instructional/training methods should be mixed in order to help combat participant boredom, etc. All of the tape/filmstrips employ the same instructional approach.

Effective instructional/training products need to provide participants with ample opportunities to practice the behavior called for in the objectives. Usually the more nearly the practice behavior simulates the desired real life behavior the more effective the product becomes.

The evaluators determined that the tape/filmstrips did provide adequate practice. However due to the fact that often the wrong objectives were chosen as far as the evaluators critique, one must question whether time should be spent in practicing the behaviors in these programs. But from a technical point of view the product did meet the criteria in this area.

One other broad category which the evaluators in their evaluation of the product actually divided into three parts but for general discussion purposes will be combined deals with the fact that the most effective instructional products usually contain procedures for giving feedback to participants. Unquestionably, participants need to have knowledge as to whether or not their progress is satisfactory. Normally it is best to provide this feedback almost immediately after a segment of instruction/train-

ing has been provided. Effective feedback procedures provide the participant with positive reinforcement when his responses have been correct and it also provides him the opportunity to immediately correct any incorrect responses before they become deeply ingrained. Generally speaking the tapes/filmstrips did provide participants with the opportunity to obtain feedback to the practice exercises.

AREA SEVEN: CONTENT BIAS

This area deals with any biases that might be present in the content of the product. Specific items checked would be whether or not racial, tribal, or religious biases had inadvertently found their way into the product. An evaluation in this area would also determine whether or not the product was free of sex role stereotyping. Other factors to be considered would be whether or not the illustrations used covered a wide variety of tribal groups rather than limiting all of their illustrations to the larger more obvious tribes. In this particular area the evaluators found the product to be adequate. While a non-Indian (evaluators) does not have difficulty identifying the obvious biases that might inadvertently be in a product, it must be remembered that the more subtle biases may go unnoticed.

AREA EIGHT: ORIENTATION AND TRAINING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

In the evaluation of a training product many times the things that are not present are as important to evaluate as those present. The evaluators were not given any materials which accompanied the product which provided instructions to the trainer

as to how he was to implement the product. These materials might have existed. However, the evaluators are of the opinion that training materials for the trainer had not been developed. A whole gamet of considerations fall under this area of consideration. It is imperative and often the eventual downfall of a product if orientation and training material and procedures do not accompany the product. Such guidelines should include:

- clear identification as to the responsibilities of the trainer and other staff
- comprehensive listing of all materials needed to effectively present the series
- description of pretraining activities and responsibilities
- specification of scheduling procedures including the amount of time to be allocated for effective presentations
- listing of participant objectives so that the trainer has no room for doubt as to what he is expected to accomplish
- detailed description of all strategies the trainer will use to accompany the product
- completely self contained material so a trainer need not go elsewhere for other resources
- training materials which promote a positive attitude on the part of the trainer
- identification of all preparation needs
- listing of all materials, equipment needed for delivery of the product and directions for use
- description of necessary facility requirements such as tables, space, etc.
- scripts for all narration, discussion or verbalization which the trainer is to deliver
- sample agendas for training sessions

Some of the inadequacies that the evaluators noted in the tape/filmstrips could have been overcome with an effective training module for the trainer as well as a participant training program with structured discussion, interaction, problem solving activities, etc., interspersed before, after, and between the various tape/filmstrips.

AREA NINE: REPORTING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

Again as in Area 8, the evaluators were not given any materials relating to how the product had fared in previous situations with varying audiences in order that the trainer could make the necessary adjustments to his particular group of participants. Moreover, it is to the advantage of the product, recognizing there is no perfect product, for concerns or problems which are apt to occur to be described along with ways the trainer can handle such problems.

AREA TEN: TIME AND COST CONSIDERATIONS

In the last broad area under installation and delivery of the product, two questions are asked -- are the time requirements for installing and conducting the product acceptable and can the training be adapted to various situations as well as are the costs of installing the product to local situations acceptable? The evaluators determined that the approach used, due to financial limitations of the technical review, would restrict judging the product on these questions. Therefore no judgement is made in this area.

TECHNICAL CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWING INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTS*

IDENTIFICATION

Title: INTRODUCTION

Sequence Number One **Instructional Length of Product** _____

Assessor RAYMOND **Date Assessed** _____

Summary Rating _____

_____

_____

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING	
				PART I
				1. OUTCOMES
☐	☐	☐	☐	a, Are expected outcomes expressed in terms of observable proficiencies participants will acquire as a result of instruction?
☐	☐	☐	☐	b. Are the outcomes, as a whole, worthwhile for participants?
☐	☐	☐	☐	c. Do the objectives relate to the purpose of the training module?
☐	☐	☐	☐	d. Are the objectives sequenced properly?
☐	☐	☐	☐	e. Are the objectives at appropriate participant level?
				2. ASSESSMENT MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES
☐	☐	☐	☐	a. Are placement measures and procedures included that clearly indicate the point at which a participant should begin instruction based on his current skill level?
☐	☐	☐	☐	b. Are measures included that periodically identify specific outcomes on which the learner may be experiencing difficulty?
☐	☐	☐	☐	c. Are end-of-program measures included that assess attainment of all outcomes?

*Adapted from (1) Considerations in Selecting Instructional Products, Appendix SWRL, 1975 (2)Assessment Instrument, A Classification Scheme for Career Education Resource Materials, HEW Office of Education, 1975. (3) Assessment Tool For Determining "Good" Staff Development Training Module,C.Raymond,1974

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. REPORTS OF PREVIOUS USE

   a. Are data presented to indicate that outcomes have been consistently attained by previous users?

   b. Are data indicating trainer and participant attitudes toward the product reported in quantitive terms and not just in the form of a few "endorsements"?

   c. Are data presented to show that the product has been used successfully in a wide range of situations?

   d. Do the data indicate that it is likely the product will be effective in local instructional situation?

4. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- ADEQUACY AND CONSISTENCY

   a. Are materials and activities keyed directly to the expected instructional outcomes?

   b. Are the instructional materials likely to promote adequate participant interest and enthusiasm?

   c. Are materials or suggestions included for separate supplementary activities for those participants not reaching acceptable achievement levels on any outcome?

   d. Are materials and procedures convenient and easy to use?

   e. To what extent is the nature and scope of the material content adequate to reach the objectives?

   f. Is the organization and presentation of the content consistent with objectives and outcomes?

   g. Does the material cover every subskill that logically contributes to the objective? Are there any gaps in the material, i.e., have any essential items of information not been included in the instructional sequence?

   h. Are any parts of the material ambiguous, too "lean", or in some other way deficient?

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING	
☐	☐	☐	☐	i. Does the material contain any unnecessary information (i.e., how much of the material must be processed by the participant in order to make the desired response?)
☐	☐	☐	☐	j. Does the product sequence the activities materials according to the difficulty of the task?
☐	☐	☐	☐	k. Are the transitions smooth between various activities of the product.

5. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- VERSATILITY

☐	☐	☐	☐	a. To what extent are various optional instructional strategies provided? (Instructional strategies are methods of teaching such as simulation, group instruction, individual programs, etc.)
☐	☐	☐	☐	b. To what extent is a range of activities provided that involves participants in different kinds of learning experiences?
☐	☐	☐	☐	c. To what extent are alternative activities for participants with special needs provided?
☐	☐	☐	☐	d. To what extent is individual as well as group instruction provided?
☐	☐	☐	☐	e. Is the material content consistent with growth and development characteristics (physical, emotional, social, and intellectual) of target groups?
☐	☐	☐	☐	f. Do those materials express identical content in more than one audiovisual medium?

6. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- SOUND LEARNING THEORY

☐	☐	☐	☐	a. Does the module have an appropriate introduction or advanced organizer to display to the participants the desired terminal behavior? (Revealing Objectives), And purpose?(Perceived Purpose).
☐	☐	☐	☐	b. Does the module provide several illustrations of all general concepts being taught?
☐	☐	☐	☐	c. Do the exemplars clearly illustrate the principles or concepts being described?

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

d. Do the activities provide for active participant involvement?

e. Are there carefully sequenced exercises designed to cover each aspect of the objectives being covered?

f. Is the delivery of the information varied? (Is there lecture, problem solving, mediation--VTR, slide-tape, reading, discovery).

h. Is there practice immediately following a short segment of instruction?

i. Does the module contain continuous feedback procedures so that the participant will get regular reports on his progress?

j. Is the feedback following each exercise clear and complete (e.g., does the feedback provide an explanation of why a particular participant response is inappropriate)?

k. Is the feedback immediately following a short segment of instruction?

7. CONTENT BIAS

a. Material contains role-models to which a member of a tribal group can relate.

b. If the material contains visuals, the characters depicted represent a variety of various tribal groups.

c. Material includes characters with names indicative of a variety of tribal groups.

d. Material is free of racial bias.

e. Material is free of tribal bias.

f. Material is free of religious bias.

g. Material is free of sex role stereotyping.

Program Number One

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING

PART II

INSTALLATION/DELIVERY OF PRODUCT

3. ORIENTATION AND TRAINING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

☐	☐	☐	☐	a. Do the materials clearly identify and define the responsibilities of all personnel involved in product use?
☐	☐	☐	☐	b. Do the materials include convenient and efficient resources (e.g., pre-program workshops, self-study materials) to orient all personnel to their individual responsibilities?
☐	☐	☐	☐	c. Are clear guidelines for instructional scheduling provided, i.e., start-up dates, instructional time allotments, pacing guidelines?
☐	☐	☐	☐	d. Are trainers provided with clear expectations of product performance?
☐	☐	☐	☐	e. To what extent are user directions provided?
☐	☐	☐	☐	f. To what extent is background information provided to the user so that the person will not have to go beyond the material to seek help?
☐	☐	☐	☐	g. To what extent are user strategies specified?
☐	☐	☐	☐	h. To what extent are directions for additional training provided?
☐	☐	☐	☐	i. To what extent are training materials identified and provided?
☐	☐	☐	☐	j. Does the module promote positive instructor attitudes?
☐	☐	☐	☐	k. Does the module indicate estimated instructional time?
☐	☐	☐	☐	l. Does the module identify instructor preparation and time needed?
☐	☐	☐	☐	m. Is there a listing of all necessary materials and equipment for delivery of the module? - as well as directions for use - detailed plans for materials that may need to be constructed?
☐	☐	☐	☐	n. Does the module contain (or give clear directions on how to locate) the required equipment and materials.?

VERY ADEQUATE	ADEQUATE	FAIR	INADEQUATE OR MISSING
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

o. Is there a description of necessary facility requirements if called for? (table arrangements, space, etc.)

p. Is there a timed sequence to follow?

q. Is there a script for all narration, discussion or verbalization done by the instructor?

r. Are there sample agendas for each session?

9. REPORTING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

a. Do the materials include means to generate and transmit frequent reports on participant achievement and progress to appropriate audiences?

b. Do the materials include resources for the improvement of problems related to instructional completion?

10. TIME AND COST CONSIDERATIONS

a. Are the time requirements for installing the product and conducting training acceptable to various situations?

b. Are the costs of installing and using the product acceptable to local situation?

TECHNICAL CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWING INSTRUCTIONAL PRODUCTS

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
1. OUTCOMES							
a. Are expected outcomes expressed in terms of observable proficiencies participants will acquire as a result of instruction?	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
b. Are the outcomes, as a whole, worthwhile for participants?	IM	F	IM	F	A	A	VA
c. Do the objectives relate to the purpose of the training module?	IM	F	F	F	A	A	VA
d. Are the objectives sequenced properly?	IM	VA	A	A	A	VA	VA
e. Are the objectives at appropriate participant level?	IM	IM	IM	IM	F	F	F
2. ASSESSMENT MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES							
a. Are placement measures and procedures included that clearly indicate the point at which a participant should begin instruction based on his current skill level?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
b. Are measures included that periodically identify specific outcomes on which the learner may be experiencing difficulty?	F	F	A	F	A	VA	M
c. Are end-of-program measures included that assess attainment of all outcomes?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
3. REPORTS OF PREVIOUS USE							
a. Are data presented to indicate that outcomes have been consistently attained by previous users?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
b. Are data indicating trainer and participant attitudes toward the product reported in quantitive terms and not just in the form of a few "endorsements"?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
3. (con't)							
c. Are data presented to show that the product has been used successfully in a wide range of situations?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
d. Do the data indicate that it is likely the product will be effective in local instructional situation?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
4. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES — ADEQUACY AND CONSISTENCY							
a. Are materials and activities keyed directly to the expected instructional outcomes?	VA	VA	A	A	VA	VA	VA
b. Are the instructional materials likely to promote adequate participant interest and enthusiasm?	IM	IM	IM	IM	F	F	F
c. Are materials or suggestions included for separate supplementary activities for those participants not reaching acceptable achievement levels on any outcome?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
d. Are materials and procedures convenient and easy to use?	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
e. To what extent is the nature and scope of the material content adequate to reach the objectives?	IM	F	IM	F	A	A	A
f. Is the organization and presentation of the content consistent with objectives and outcomes?	A	A	A	A	A	VA	VA
g. Does the material cover every subskill that logically contributes to the objective? Are there any gaps in the material, i.e., have any essential items of information not been included in the instructional sequence?	A	A	F	A	A	VA	VA
h. Are any parts of the material ambiguous, too "lean", or in some other way deficient?	IM	IM	IM	IM	F	A	VA

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
4. (con't)							
i. Does the material contain any unnecessary information (i.e., how much of the material must be processed by the participant in order to make the desired response?)	IM	IM	IM	IM	F	VA	VA
j. Does the product sequence the activities materials according to the difficulty of the task?	IM	F	A	A	VA	VA	VA
k. Are the transitions smooth between various activities of the product?	IM	A	A	A	VA	VA	VA
5. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- VERSATILITY							
a. To what extent are various optional instructional strategies provided? (Instructional strategies are methods of teaching such as simulation, group instruction, individual programs, etc.)	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
b. To what extent is a range of activities provided that involves participants in different kinds of learning experiences?	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
c. To what extent are alternative activities for participants with special needs provided?	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
d. To what extent is individual as well as group instruction provided?	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
e. Is the material content consistent with growth and development characteristics (physical, emotional, social, and intellectual) of target groups?	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
f. Do those materials express identical content in more than one audiovisual medium?	IM	IM	M	M	M	M	M
6. MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES -- SOUND LEARNING THEORY							
a. Does the module have an appropriate introduction or advanced organizer to display to the participants the desired terminal behavior? (Revealing Objectives), and purpose? (Perceived Purpose).	F	F	IM	A	A	A	VA

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
6. (con't)							
b. Does the module provide several illustrations of all general concepts being taught?	IM	IM	IM	F	A	VA	A
c. Do the exemplars clearly illustrate the principles or concepts being described?	IM	IM	IM	F	A	A	A
d. Do the activities provide for active participant involvement?	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM	IM
e. Are there carefully sequenced exercises designed to cover each aspect of the objectives being covered?	F	IM	IM	F	A	A	M
f. Is the delivery of the information varied? (Is there lecture, problem solving, mediation—VTR, slide-tape, reading, discovery).	IM	M	M	M	M	M	M
g. Is there practice immediately following a short segment of instruction?	VA	A	A	F	A	A	M
h. Does the module contain continuous feedback procedures so that the participant will get regular reports on his progress?	VA	VA	VA	A	VA	VA	M
i. Is the feedback following each exercise clear and complete (e.g., does the feedback provide an explanation of why a particular participant response is inappropriate)?	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	M
j. Is the feedback immediately following a short segment of instruction?	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	M
7. CONTENT BIAS							
a. Material contains role-models to which a member of a tribal group can relate.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
b. If the material contains visuals, the characters depicted represent a variety of various tribal groups.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
c. Material includes characters with names indicative of a variety of tribal groups.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
7. (con't)							
d. Material is free of racial bias.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
e. Material is free of tribal bias.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
f. Material is free of religious bias.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
g. Material is free of sex role stereotyping.	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA	VA
8. ORIENTATION AND TRAINING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES							
a. Do the materials clearly identify and define the responsibilities of all personnel involved in product use?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
b. Do the materials include convenient and efficient resources (e.g., pre-program workshops, self-study materials) to orient all personnel to their individual responsibilities?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
c. Are clear guidelines for instructional scheduling provided, i.e., start-up dates, instructional time allotments, pacing guidelines?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
d. Are trainers provided with clear expectations of product performance?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
e. To what extent are user directions provided?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
f. To what extent is background information provided to the user so that the person will not have to go beyond the material to seek help?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
g. To what extent are user strategies specified?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
h. To what extent are directions for additional training provided?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
i. To what extent are training materials identified and provided?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M

8. (con't)	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
j. Does the module promote positive instructor attitudes?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
k. Does the module indicate estimated instructional time?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
l. Does the module identify instructor preparation and time needed?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
m. Is there a listing of all necessary materials and equipment for delivery of the module? - as well as directions for use - detailed plans for materials that may need to be constructed?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
n. Does the module contain (or give clear directions on how to locate) the required equipment and materials?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
o. Is there a description of necessary facility requirements if called for? (table arrangements, space, etc.)	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
p. Is there a timed sequence to follow?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
q. Is there a script for all narration, discussion or verbalization done by the instructor?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
r. Are there sample agendas for each session?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
9. REPORTING MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES							
a. Do the materials include means to generate and transmit frequent reports on participant achievement and progress to appropriate audiences?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
b. Do the materials include resources for the improvement of problems related to instructional completion?	M	M	M	M	M	M	M

	TAPE #1	TAPE #2	TAPE #3	TAPE #4	TAPE #5	TAPE #6	TAPE #7
10. TIME AND COST CONSIDERATIONS							
a. Are the time requirements for installing the product and conducting training acceptable to various situations?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
b. Are the costs of installing and using the product acceptable to local situation?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

?

APPENDIX B

COPIES OF INSTRUMENTS DEVELOPED

PRESIDENTIAL SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVES FOR MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN EDUCATION

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION-GATHERING QUESTIONAIRE

Date: _____

AREA OFFICE: _____

PART I.

Name of Project Manager:

_____ Telephone No. _____

Agencies Involved:	Names of Responsible Agency Personnel (Include Telephone No's.)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PART II. (Please enclose)

1. Area Plan for Implementation
2. Monthly Progress Reports
3. Reports of Presentations
4. Audience Response Forms (if any)
5. Any other documents you deem important
6. Schedules of future presentations (Please include dates, places and times.)

ENCLOSURE (2)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONAIRE

Area Office:_____

Agency Office:_____

Tribal Group: _____

Individuals Name:_____

1. What Kind of School does your tribe have?

2. Have you heard about contract schools?

3. Do you know about the different kinds of schools you can have, other than contract or BIA schools?

***4. Did you hear about the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for the management of Education for Indian People?

5. Did you attend a presentation on this P/SO, if so, how many?

6. What is your understanding of P/SO?

7. Do you feel it can help or hurt Indian People?

8. When you heard the presentation, did you have any questions about it?

9. What do you think could make this better for your People?

10. What did you like best about this presentation?

11. What didn't you like about the presentation?

12. Would you go to another presentation?

13. Is there a statement you would like to make about P/SO or about the presentation? If so use the back of this paper.

*** If this question is answered, Yes, then ask the following questions.

PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVE (M.B.O.)

GUIDELINES FOR AREA/AGENCY OFFICES

1. Area Office strategy and implement plan.
   (Obtain copies and monthly progress reports)

2. Identify:

   a. Personnel making presentations

   b. Attitude of Area Manager and Staff

   c. Knowledge of Pres/Sec. Objective

   d. Individual's personal opinion of P/S Objective

   e. Groups that have had presentations made.

   f. Names of individuals who have attended presentations.

3. Make written summary of visitation. Attach all pertenint materials. Include personal observation.

PART III. (use extra paper, if necessary)

B.

1. **Name of Tribal Group that <u>will</u> have presentation/s:**

_____

Name of individual to contact:

_____ **Telephone No.**_____

How may contact be made:

_____

_____

Date presentation planned_____**Location**_____

Pertinent Information: (as to why and how to be made, if bi-lingual and etc.)

_____

_____

_____

2. **Name of Tribal Group that <u>will</u> have presentation/s:**

_____

Name of individual to contact:

_____ **Telephone No.**_____

How may contact be made:

_____

_____

Date presentation planned_____

Pertinent Information: (as to why and how to be made, if bi-lingual and etc.)

_____

_____

_____

PART III. (use extra paper, if necessary)

A.

1. Name of Tribal Group that has had presentation/s:

_____

Name of Individual to contact:

_____ Telephone No._____

How may contact be made?

_____

_____

Date presentation made: _____ Number Attend._____

Action taken:_____

Are additional presentations planned?_____ _____

2. Name of Tribal Group that has had presentation/s:

_____

Name of Individual to contact:

_____ Telephone No._____

How may contact be made?

_____

_____

Date presentation made:_____ Number Attend._____

Action taken:_____

Are additional presentations planned? _____

3. Name of Tribal Group that has had presentation/s:

_____

Name of Individual to contact:

_____ Telephone No._____

How may contact be made?

_____

_____

Date presentation made:_____ Number Attend._____

Action taken:_____

Are additional presentations planned?_____

AGENCY OFFICE

INTERVIEW QUESTIONAIRE

Area Office:_____

Agency Office:_____

Agency Persons Name:_____

1. How do you feel about P/SO?

2. What recommendations do you have to improve implementing the over-all program?

3. Does the amount of Training and Orientation you received, aid or hinder you?

4. If you could start this program over, do you feel results would be different?

5. What do you feel the final results will be, as things are now?

6. Please state your personal opinion as to why Tribal groups seem hesitant?

7. Are there points of P/SO, that you feel should be clarified to you? (i.e.,retrosession, PL93-638 and strategies toward unspecified goals)

8. Do you feel that P/SO is a positive move toward, true Indian Self-Determination?

9. What are the most common negative feelings that you have heard toward P/SO?

10. Do you feel adequate in being able to handle these objections?

11. What have been positive remarks or feelings toward P/SO?

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER
SUITE 204 • 2121 SOUTH MILL AVENUE • TEMPE, ARIZONA 85282
PHONE (602) 967-9484

July 15, 1975

Dear Tribal Leader:

The National Indian Training and Research Center is under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make an evaluation of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective Program. Our purpose in writing is to request your assistance in developing a status report of your Tribe with reference to the selection of future management options affecting your BIA school or schools.

The goal of the Bureau's P/SO program is to get tribes to select a management option for the future operation of the remaining BIA schools. Most of you may have seen some of the slide-tape presentations where the management options are explained. The options are:

(1) to transfer the BIA school to a public school operation
(2) to contract with the BIA for the operation of the school
(3) to remain as is - a BIA school
(4) a combination of the above options

The P/S objective is to get tribes to select an option formally; that is, by tribal resolution.

We need your help to assist us in the development of a present status report. To save your time we are enclosing an easy-to-complete questionaire along with a self-addressed, ready-to-mail envelope for your convenience.

Your assistance is appreciated very much.

Sincerely Yours,

Francis McKinley

Francis McKinley
Executive Director

FM/sm

Enclosures

STATUS REPORT - SCHOOL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS (for Tribal Leaders)

1. Were the people on your reservation generally familiar with the BIA policy of changing the management of BIA schools when requested by the tribes even before the P/S objective was announced? YES NO

2. Are the people now generally familiar with the option for the tribe to contract for the operation of a BIA school? YES NO

3. Are the people generally familiar with other options for the management of BIA schools? YES NO

4. Have you seen any of the BIA slide-tape presentations that describe the school management options? YES NO

5. Has there been any follow-up meetings or discussions of the school management options as a result of the slide-tape presentations made on your reservation? YES NO

6. Has your tribe reached a decision about the future management of your remaining BIA school or schools? YES NO

7. If no formal decision (by tribal resolution) has been reached, what is <u>your</u> <u>opinion</u> as to why no decision has been made at this time?

_____

_____

_____

8. What do you suggest that would be a good way to get the message to the Indian people that they have a choice as to who should run the present BIA school (or schools) in their community?

_____

_____

_____

9. What is <u>your</u> <u>opinion</u> as to which of the below management options is favored by the people in your district or tribe?

   a. Tribal contract for the operation of the BIA school
   b. Transfer the BIA school to a public school
   c. Make no change; remain a BIA school

   or

   d. The people prefer not to be rushed into making decisions before they are ready.

10. Please feel free to make any other comments (on back of page) that would help us to make a good evaluation of the BIA's P/S Objective Program.

Thank you very much. National Indian Training and Research Center

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER

SUITE 204 • 2121 SOUTH MILL AVENUE • TEMPE, ARIZONA 85282

PHONE (602) 967-9484

November, 1975

The BIA is promoting a program of options with reference to the future management of BIA schools. The National Indian Training and Research Center has contracted to make an evaluation of this program. The program itself resulted from a Presidential and Secretarial Objective and is popularly referred to as the P/SO program.

Our purpose in this brief interview is to find out how you feel this program is progressing with reference to the communities on your reservation where BIA schools are located.

You do not need to sign your name. We need only

Your reservation: _____

Your home community: _____

BIA school (or schools): _____

Please give us your comments on the following questions:

1. To your knowledge has the matter of options pertaining to the future management of BIA schools been presented to the people where these schools are located?

YES NO UNKNOWN

If your answer is YES, how was the program of options presented to the people?

_____

_____

2. Are you familiar with the slide-tape presentations that are being used as one means of presenting the program?

YES NO If YES, do you have any comment about them?

_____

_____

3. Do you feel the people in the home community where a BIA school is located are interested in pursuing P/SO in order to select a management option?

YES NO UNKNOWN

4. Do you feel they know enough about it to make a management option decision?

YES NO UNKNOWN

5. What is your opinion on why many Tribes are hesitant in making a decision about the management options available to them?

_____

_____

6. What would be a good way to get the message to the Indian people that they have a choice as to who should run the present BIA school (or schools) in their community?

_____

_____

7. What is your opinion as to which of the below management options is favored by the people in your district or tribe?

a. Tribe contract for the operation of the BIA school
b. Transfer the BIA school to a public school
c. Make no change; remain a BIA school
d. The people prefer not to be rushed into making decisions before they are ready.

Please feel free to make any other comments (on back of pages) that would help us to make a good evaluation of the BIA's P/S Objective Program.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER
SUITE 204 • 2121 SOUTH MILL AVENUE • TEMPE, ARIZONA 85282
PHONE (602) 967-9484

To the Members and Alternates of the Phoenix

Inter-Tribal School Board (and any visiting guests)

You have seen a slide-tape presentation which provides information that is basic to a tribal decision about selecting a management option for the future operation of the remaining BIA schools.

Perhaps all of you are aware of the BIA's Presidential/Secretarial Objective Program (referred to as the P/SO program). It is an important tool of management especially as it relates to the goals and philosophy of Indian self-determination.

Most of you may not know that the National Indian Training and Research Center is under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make an evaluation of the P/SO program.

We need your help in assembling vital information that will assist the BIA in its effort to get the message to Indian people that they have a choice as to who should run the BIA schools.

There are separate easy-to-complete questionaires. Please give us your opinion on each of the questions asked. You do not need to sign your name.

We would be happy to have any visiting tribal members at this meeting complete the questionaires also.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely Yours,

Francis McKinley
Executive Director

Francis McKinley

FM/sm & w?

Most of you are "wearing two hats"; that is, you are not only a member of the Phoenix Area Inter-Tribal School Board, but you may live in a community where there is a BIA school. Hence, you may have a broader interest in the P/SO program.

The purpose of this questionaire is to get <u>your</u> <u>opinion</u> on:

1. The slide-tape presentations you have seen;
2. P/SO as it relates to the Phoenix Area School Board; and
3. P/SO as it may relate to your home community.

<u>The Slide-Tape Presentations you have seen</u>.

1. In your opinion how would you rate the effectiveness of the filmstrips which you have seen?

   /___/ Superior
   /___/ Above Average
   /___/ Average
   /___/ Mediocre
   /___/ Bottom of the Barrel

2. How clear was the message that was presented in the filmstrips?

   /___/ Superior
   /___/ Above Average
   /___/ Average
   /___/ Mediocre
   /___/ Bottom of the Barrel

3. How was the overall <u>pace</u> of the filmstrips?

   /___/ Pace was just right
   /___/ Pace was far too fast
   /___/ Pace was a little too fast
   /___/ Pace was far too slow
   /___/ Pace was a little too slow

4. How well did the filmstrips hold your <u>interest</u>?

   /___/ You were highly interested all the time
   /___/ You were interested most of the time
   /___/ You had high interest at the start but lost interest
   /___/ You were only interested for brief periods of time
   /___/ You have very little interest at all

5. Judging against other BIA information dissemination programs that you have seen, how would you rate the filmstrips?

- [ ] Superior
- [ ] Above Average
- [ ] Average
- [ ] Mediocre
- [ ] Bottom of the Barrel

6. If you were responsible for explaining the various management options to tribal members would you use the filmstrips?

- [ ] Yes...without a doubt
- [ ] More than likely
- [ ] Only parts of each filmstrip
- [ ] Probably not
- [ ] No...would not use

7. How appropriate do you feel that content and vocabulary of the filmstrips are for the majority of your tribal members?

- [ ] Very appropriate
- [ ] About right
- [ ] A little too difficult
- [ ] Quite difficult
- [ ] Extremely difficult

8. Were there any portions of the filmstrips that seem especially inappropriate or distasteful to you?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

If your answer is yes would you please comment_____

_____

_____

9. What do you think were the two most important points of each filmstrip that you saw?

(1) _____

_____

(2) _____

_____

10. Any other additional comments that you would like to make about the filmstrips? (use back of page)

P/SO as it relates to the Phoenix Area Inter-Tribal School Board

1. Now that you have some information on the management options for running BIA schools, do you feel that some type of action is in order now? YES NO

2. If YES, what should the Board do? _____

_____

_____

3. If NO, what are the problems or "stumbling blocks" to making a decision?

_____

_____

_____

4. Contracting by the Board to run the Phoenix Area Boarding Schools would appear to be one feasible option.

   a. Would you favor contracting? YES NO DO NOT KNOW YET

   b. If YES, when would you favor such a step? _____

   _____

   _____

   c. If NO, what would be your reasons? _____

   _____

   _____

   d. If you DO NOT KNOW YET, what should the Bureau do that would be helpful to the Board in making a decision?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

P/SO as it may relate to your home community and Tribe

1. Do you feel the people in the home community where a BIA school is located, are interested in pursuing P/SO in order to select a management option? YES NO UNKNOWN

2. Do you feel they know enough about it to make a management option decision? YES NO UNKNOWN

3. Why are the Phoenix Area Tribes hesitant in making a decision about the management options available to them?

_____

_____

_____

4. What would be a good way to get the message to the Indian people that they have a choice as to who should run the present BIA school (or schools) in their community?

_____

_____

_____

5. What is your opinion as to which of the below management options is favored by the people in your district or tribe?

   a. Tribe contract for the operation of the BIA school
   b. Transfer the BIA school to a public school
   c. Make no change; remain a BIA school

   or

   d. The people prefer not to be rushed into making decisions before they are ready.

Please feel free to make any other comments (on back of pages) that would help us to make a good evaluation of the BIA's P/S Objective Program.

Check who you are: BOARD MEMBER, ALTERNATE BD. MEMBER, GUEST

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

NATIONAL INDIAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTER

SECTION III: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
UNDERWOOD RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF

THE PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVE

FOR INDIAN EDUCATION

George W. Underwood
Attorney at Law
Certified Public Accountant
DBA Underwood Research & Evaluation
5963 East 31st Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM..... 1

SITE VISITS

ABERDEEN AREA..... 3

MUSKOGEE AREA..... 10

ANADARKO AREA..... 12

EASTERN AREA..... 13

EVALUATION OF TRAINING PACKET..... 15

EVALUATION OF AREA OPERATING PLANS..... 17

EVALUATION OF CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATING PLANS..... 19

SURVEY DATA..... 20

APPENDIX..... 27

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE PRESIDENTIAL/SECRETARIAL OBJECTIVE

Statement of the Problem

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, along with other agencies of the Federal Government, is employing a systems approach administrative strategy known generally as Management By Objectives (MBO). The strategy calls for prioritization of objectives, the highest being accorded a Presidential and/or Secretarial level rating. The Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Indian education for FY 1975 concerns selections of a management system for their schools, by Indian and native Alaskan people currently being served by these federal schools. The selection made is to be an informed decision, which is reached after careful consideration of available options. The responsibility to package and present objective information upon which such decisions must be based, was placed upon the BIA Education Office.

The present study attempts to evaluate the effectiveness with which BIA has disseminated information regarding school management by Indian peoples. Specifically, the study has assessed the adequacy of the Bureau's strategies and plans for attainment of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective for Indian education.

Sources of Information

The following report is based upon information from four major sources:

1. Site visits to Indian schools in the Aberdeen, Muskogee, Anadarko, and Eastern Areas, with interviews conducted with the target audiences.*

---

*Target audiences are: Members of tribal governments, tribal members, BIA school board members, parents of BIA students, and staff members of BIA schools.

2. Survey instruments completed by target audiences.

3. Review by the research team of the BIA-prepared training packet which addresses the Presidential/Secretarial Objective.

4. Review of the reports and monitoring procedures of the four Area Offices regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective.

Design and Procedures

The work as specified in the contract was performed in three stages. The first, or planning stage, was between May 8, 1975, and May 25, 1975. The first stage of the study entailed a visitation to the Indian Education Resources Center office, and a gathering together of the appropriate Research and Evaluation Reports, such as Research and Evaluation Reports 29.00-29.04.

In addition, the program training package, along with various monitoring reports, were obtained by the study team. Meetings were arranged with BIA Central Office Project personnel in Washington, D. C., and in the four participating Area Offices (Aberdeen, Anadarko, Eastern, and Muskogee).

Survey instrumentation needed for the study was developed during this phase. In conjunction with the Indian Education Resources Center, priorities with respect to target populations should be members of tribal governments, advisory school board memebers, and parents of BIA school students. Although these aforementioned groups were accorded highest priority, several other concerned groups were also surveyed during the evaluation effort. Data from these various groups will be presented later in the report.

Stage 2, the data gathering stage, spanned from May 25, 1975, through December 15, 1975. During this phase, research teams conducted site visits in all four Areas concerned. Structured interviews were conducted with BIA Area and Agency personnel, tribal councils, school board members, and teachers and administrators in the BIA schools themselves. All concerned parties were given ample opportunity to express views, make recommendations, and to provide any commentary for possible inclusion in the final evaluation report. In addition to the site visits themselves, survey instrumentation which had been developed in stage 1, was sent out to several target populations.

Stage 3 involved analysis of the interview and survey data, and preparation of the final report. Stage 3 was from December 15, 1975, to the date of issuance of the final report.

Site Visits

Aberdeen: The study team conducted on-site visits to the schools in the Aberdeen Area from June 15, 1975, through August 8, 1975. During that period of time, the Area Office and fourteen schools in the Aberdeen Area were visited. Each site visit to a particular school is described below.

Crow Creek School, Crow Creek Reservation

The study team visited Crow Creek School and interviewed the Agency Superintendent, and the Principal. It was learned that the Crow Creek High School has already been contracted and that this present arrangement is felt to be satisfactory. The school board had become well-acquainted with the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, and had considered contracting for the elementary school, but has taken no formal action.

Lower Brule School, Lower Brule Reservation

On August 4, the research team visited the Lower Brule School, and conducted an in-depth interview with the Agency Superintendent. The Superintendent described the funding of the Lower Brule School as consisting of Public School District and BIA funds, along with Impact funds. The school at that time had approximately eight Indian teachers.

In a meeting of parents called by the Superintendent, there was no interest expressed by them in the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. Therefore, no further meetings were held. Formal presentations were given to school board members and to school principals. Reaction to the training packet prepared by the BIA was mostly favorable. The one critical comment made was that the packet was entirely too long. However, the overall reaction was that the packet provided a great deal of valid information. Reaction on the part of education staff members who received presentations were similarly positive. No formal presentations were given to the tribal council members.

Another interview was conducted with the principal of the elementary school, who, having been principal only since June, had not had an opportunity to see the training packet. Finally, an interview with the school counselor, was conducted. The counselor indicated that she had been given a presentation of the training packet by Aberdeen Area personnel. Her reaction to the material was positive. In short, it appears that considerable effort to apprise target populations of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective was made, and that the reaction to the BIA-prepared training packet was, for the most part, positive.

Eagle Butte School, Cheyenne River Reservation

On Tuesday, August 5, a visit was made to the Eagle Butte School District and an interview conducted with the Acting Education Program Administrator. The Acting Education Program Administrator indicated that presentations of the training packet had been given to the cooperative school board consisting of three tribal councils, three school boards, and one high school senior. The reaction of the cooperative school board to the presentation was mixed. General feeling was that the presentation provided valid information, but that the packet was too redundant and elementary. When asked about grass roots awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, the Acting Education Program Administrator felt that there was probably very little. Amongst those acquainted with the Objective, there seemed to be little fear that the Objective implied "termination."

Swift Bird Day School, Cheyenne River Reservation

An in-depth interview was conducted by the research team with a member of the school staff. She indicated that presentations regarding management options were made to parents and all staff members of the school, along with the school board members and Title I advisory board members. The presentation was made by the Education Program Administrator, and an Agency Education Specialist, and was felt to be highly successful; that is, those attending the meeting felt that they understood well the management options available to them. In addition, there was no particular concern about termination on the part of the parents or the education staff.

White Horse School, Cheyenne River Reservation

A site visit was made to the White Horse School, and an interview conducted

with the principal, who had been school principal for a period of 20 years. Presentations of the training packet had been provided to the cooperative school board which serves for White Horse and Promise Day Schools, and a number of parents. Presentation was made by the Education Program Administrator. Reaction to the presentation was generally positive on the part of school board members, school staff, and some parents. The principal felt that there was probably very little awareness of the management options on the part of most parents, and also on the part of tribal representatives. There seemed to be some fear of termination in response to the presentation made. The training packet was generally felt to be valid and adequate.

Crazy Horse School, Pine Ridge Reservation

On Wednesday, August 6, a site visit was made to Crazy Horse School, and an interview conducted with the Acting Principal. The Acting Principal expressed a feeling that most of the concerned populations on the Pine Ridge Reservation felt that if one school contracted, that all schools must contract.

In addition to an interview with the Acting Principal, interviews were conducted with other members of the school staff. Other interviews were conducted with three school board members. There appeared to be minimal awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective and the management options available.

Little Wound (Kyle) School, Pine Ridge Reservation

An interview was conducted on August 6, with the principal of Little Wound School. He indicated that several presentations had been given to school board members and to education staff, but that there was typically poor attendance. In addition, the principal indicated that the school board

had passed "contracting resolutions" several times in the recent past, but to no avail. The feeling on the part of the board was that BIA was not seriously interested in contracting.

American Horse Day School, Pine Ridge Reservation

On August 6, a site visit was made by the research team to the American Horse Day School. Interviews were conducted at the school with the Acting Principal, and with a Title I aide. In addition, a telephone interview was conducted with the chairman of the school board. The chairman indicated that all school board members had been given a presentation, as had a number of the parents. As a function of these presentations, he estimated that perhaps 85% of the community was already aware of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective and had some understanding of the management options available. The reaction to the presentations created some feelings of fear of termination, and revealed a fair amount of satisfaction with the present school arrangement.

Porcupine School, Pine Ridge Reservation

In the absence of the principal, one of the staff members served in his behalf. In addition to interviewing the Acting Principal, two teachers were also interviewed. A telephone interview was conducted with a school board member. The school board member indicated that board members had made repeated requests to the Area Office for presentations, but that the requests had not yet been honored. It was felt that there was probably little widespread information regarding management options available under the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. All those interviewed shared these views.

Manderson School, Pine Ridge Reservation

A site visit was made by the research team to Manderson School. An interview was held with the teacher-supervisor and Acting Principal. A member of the teaching staff was also interviewed. It was learned that presentations had been given, and that there was an awareness on the part of board members. Parents were felt to be well-informed about the management options available and frequently engaged in discussions of them. It was not certain whether the training packet was utilized in the presentations.

Pine Ridge

An extensive interview was conducted with the Education Program Administrator at Pine Ridge. He indicated that there had been extensive presentation of the management options, utilizing the training packets. Presentations were made by principals, with some help from the Education Program Administrator. Presentations were made to board members and tribal council members. Reaction to the presentations was generally positive. While the presentations were felt to be too prolonged, it was also felt that they quite adequately explained management options available. The Education Program Administrator made a plea for the availability of more of the training packets, since they had been utilized so successfully. He further indicated that even more presentations would have been made had it not been for recent difficulty on the Pine Ridge Reservation, which caused people to be reluctant to attend evening meetings.

Oglala Community School, Pine Ridge Reservation

A site visit was made to the Oglala Community School, and an interview conducted with the high school principal. He indicated that the president

of the school board had made several presentations to explain contracting, and that most, but not all, board members had seen the training packet. In addition, the school newspaper "War Cry" had carefully covered the management options available. There was mixed sentiment on the part of board members, with some wishing to contract, and others wishing to remain "as is." It was felt that the coverage in the school paper had resulted in considerable awareness on the part of townspeople regarding the management options available.

Loneman Day School, Pine Ridge Reservation

The research team made a site visit to Loneman Day School and interviewed the principal. He indicated that two films had been shown to school board members at PTA meetings, and that the response was essentially negative. Some board members made threats to withdraw children if the school did contract. The community appears to be very divided regarding the possibilities of contracting. It appears that factions have developed on the part of board members, with several board members living in housing projects away from the communities they are supposed to represent. In addition, there is some controversy as to who are the "real" representatives, with the present existence of two school boards. It was felt that a vote taken now by tribal members would defeat contract arrangements.

Cherry Creek School, Cheyenne River Reservation

At the Cherry Creek School, the research team spoke with the janitor, the only person on the premises. He indicated that there was concern over opening the school in September. At that time, he felt quite uncertain about the likelihood of its opening.

Muskogee: On June 12, 1975, the research team made a visit to the Muskogee Area Office. There they met with and interviewed the Assistant Area Director for Education. He indicated that the tribal chairmen were notified that, if they wanted a presentation on the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, the Area Office would be glad to send the training packet to them. He reported that only one tribal council member at that time, made a request for such information. However, there is no indication that that person pursued the request by making further contact or inquiry with the Area Office. In addition, the inter-tribal council was informed that it could make a presentation regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective was not placed on any agenda.

He expressed the view that, to familiarize tribal council members with the various options available (through presentation of the training packet), would appear to infringe upon the independent decision-making of these tribes. A similar position was taken by a Education Specialist formerly Project Director at Muskogee, when visited by the research team in Washington, D. C.

Sequoyah School

On June 12, 1975, the research team visited Sequoyah School and interviewed the Acting Superintendent for the summer, while the Superintendent was on educational leave. The Acting Superintendent indicated that he had received no information regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective from the Area Office, and that such discussions among the school personnel, or in faculty meetings regarding these objectives, were merely the curiosity of individual people. He further indicated that he had been given no

instructions to engage in any other activity regarding the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective.

At a later meeting (some three months later) with the Superintendent, the research team learned that he, also, had been given no instructions to provide presentations to his faculty and staff members or to any other possible target populations.

However, a letter dated February 7, 1975, was sent to the tribal chiefs of the area tribes involved, informing them of their options under the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, and requesting their cooperation in implementing the Objective. The letter was signed by the Acting Area Director.

Eufaula, Jones, and Carter Schools

The study team made brief visits to each of the three dormitory schools noted above, and interviewed the following people: The counselor, Eufaula; assistant principal, Jones; and at Carter, several staff members. At these dormitory schools, there was no awareness of the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective, nor had there been any presentations to them or to the staff members.

In view of the above observations, it would appear that responsibility for disseminating information regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective had not been assumed by the Muskogee Area personnel. The reason for the unassumed responsibility, it appears, is that Muskogee Area personnel have not felt that they should undertake such responsibility. This confusion is felt to be the major obstacle to successful information-dissemination in this Area.

Anadarko: On May 28, 1975, the research team visited the Anadarko Area Office, and conducted interviews with members of the Education staff, and it was learned that a number of meeting addressing the Presidential/Secretarial Objective had been held with tribal councils. Ten tribes had been contacted in the Anadarko Area, with meetings being held at Ft. Sill, Riverside, and Anadarko. Attendance at these meetings was minimal, possibly as a result of lack of compensation to attend. Presentations had also been made to advisory school boards at Chilocco and Haskell. In three of these meetings, no materials from the training packet were used, however, in two instances some of the manuals were utilized. The reaction on the part of the Area Director was that the training packet presented the material in "too simplistic" a fashion. In one case, at Chilocco, the meeting was felt to have produced negative results in that the council members felt that the contract school concept was being pushed to the exclusion of other possible options. In other instances, the imposed decision deadline (June 30, 1975) was objected to by tribal people, since it was felt that more time would be required to make such an important determination.

On the afternoon of May 28, the research team asked to attend a Kiowa Housing meeting being held in the Area Office building. Of the eight Kiowas in attendance, only two had ever heard of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, and felt that they had minimal information. The other six in attendance had not heard of the school options available for Indian schools.

Riverside School

The research team made a site visit to the Riverside School. At that time, the team interviewed the principal and the superintendent of the Riverside School. The Riverside principal indicated that the Presidential/Secretarial

Objective had been discussed in staff meetings, and that staff members were well acquainted with the Objective. He indicated that there was little grass roots information regarding management options available for Indian schools. He indicated that he was under no instruction to pursue any further activities regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective with the Riverside School Board, and with his teaching staff. He further indicated that he had attended two meetings where a presentation of the management options available were made by Area Office personnel. These meetings were held at the Riverside School and Agency office, with approximately seven or more tribes in attendance. There did not appear to be any further contact or activity, or reaction to the presentations, after the initial meetings were held.

Fort Sill School

On may 29, 1975, the research team interviewed the Acting Superintendent of the Fort Sill Indian School. There seemed to be minimal awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective at Fort Sill, with no activities apparently having been taken, and with no insturction to engage in any activities addressing the Objective.

Eastern: On July 7, 1975, the research team visited the Cherokee Agency Office in Cherokee, North Carolina. Interviews were conducted with the Agency Superintendent, and with the chairman of the tribal council. They indicated that their interpretation of instructions from the Area Office was that, if there was no interest on the part of tribes for contracting per se, then no resolution from tribal councils was necessary. The research team interviewed several individual tribal council members who

were meeting on that date. None had heard of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. However, several were cognizant of the contracting only of specific activities, such as food services and busing. An interview on July 1, 1975, was held with the Assistant Area Director for Education in the Eastern Area. He indicated that he had received letters from the chiefs of the Seminole, Choctaw, and Cherokee Tribes, indicating that these tribes did not want to change the present management system, but wanted to remain "as is." Although these decisions were apparently based upon tirbal action, there is considerable indication that no formal tribal action was taken on these questions. The Miccosukee Tribe had already become a contract school at this time. The Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana, when offered a presentation of the management objectives, declined the invitation. It was learned that the Cherokee Tribal Council members were not familiar with the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, nor had they been presented with the training packet.

Choctaw Central School

The research team made a site visit on November 18, 1975, to the Choctaw Central School and met with the Assistant Principal. She indicated that no formal staff presentations regarding the Objective had been given, but that some of her staff members were acquainted with the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective. On that same day, the research team met and interviewed a Choctaw tribal employee, operating as a school planner. One of his functions was to train the school board in school planning, and to acquaint them with possible management options available. He indicated that filmstrips had been presented in the surrounding communities and that they had been felt to be useful to thos receiving the presentations.

He further indicated that a master planning program for the school board, using filmstrips and slides was being shown monthly at regular school board meetings. The Agency Superintendent and tribal officials were interviewed and they reported considerable interest in contracting among the Choctaws.

Evaluation of Training Packet

The research team has reviewed the entire BIA-prepared training packet dealing with the management options for Indian education. In addition, team members have interviewed dozens of persons who had utilized the packet in order to give a presentation to a target audience, or who had been given a presentation utilizing the training packet. The following generalizations about the training packet, therefore, are a compilation of reactions on the part of the research team who studied the materials, and on the part of several dozens of people who were interviewed or surveyed regarding the training material.

It was virtually unanimous that the information contained in the training materials was accurate and could be relied upon. It was also practically unanimous that the materials were far too long to be presented efficiently. Several persons commented that perhaps one person could be trained with the entire packet, and then could refine and abbreviate presentations by providing synopses and summaries of the rather voluminous materials in the packet. Many comments were voiced regarding the level of difficulty of the material themselves. The most often expressed comment was that the materials were much too simplified, perhaps even insulting to the intellectual levels of most Indian peoples. However, smaller numbers of critics indicated that the materials were too complicated, and should be simplified somewhat.

Overall, it was felt by the research team that the materials were made somewhat more simplified than perhaps necessary. In fairness to the developers of the training materials, it should be noted that the task imposed to develop such a training packet was a most ambitious one; that is, to communicate great reams of technical and philosophical information to a great variety of peoples, some with extensive exposrue to such technical materials and some no exposure whatsoever; some highly educated and sophisticated, and others with very little education or sophistication in such legal and technical matters. It is doubtful that the finest of all training packets could be effective in communicating well with the diversity of people involved in the taregt populations.

Recommendations

The study team strongly feels that the training packet not only should be used, but that its use should be mandatory in all Areas. Furthermore, it is recommended that individual persons should be designated to become expert in the content of the training packet, and to interpret the training packet in accordance with their sensitivity to the needs and levels of understanding of the target audiences. This recommendation is one possible way to avoid the claims of "insultingly simplistic," or "far too complex," which, as noted above, were often made in reaction to the presentation. Since the content was felt to be highly valid, and since the packet contains little or no irrelevant content, little can be accomplished by attempting to condense the existing training packet. Any shortening or condensation would probably have to be accomplished, as mentioned above, by having a trained person interpret in a manner appropriate to the given target population.

Evaluation of the Operating Plans
in the Area Offices

Aberdeen Area

Of the four Areas under study in the present research effort, the Aberdeen Area is clearly the most advanced with respect to the implementation of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. As noted in the descriptions of activities accomplished in each of the respective schools studied, there were numerous presentations made to the target audiences in the Aberdeen Area, and considerably more awareness of the management options available than in any of the other three Areas under consideration. It appears, from examination of correspondences, that the Area Office personnel have maintained excellent communication with the tribal councils, the school boards, and with the education personnel of the schools themselves. It appears, however, that there is little awareness of the management options and the Presidential/Secretarial Objective on the part of grass roots members of the tribes involved. However, it should be noted, that such a condition is not unique to Indian tribes, but may be a condition of political apathy on the part of many citizens in our society.

Anadarko Area

As noted in the description of activities in the Anadarko Area, there was some awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. Although there seemed to have been some initial activities addressing the Objective, there does not seem to be much current activity (as of June, 1975), or adequate reporting between the tribes, the Area Office, and the Central Office. The Area Office seems to believe that sufficient information regarding the

management options has been conveyed to the tribal chiefs, the tribal councils, and to the tribal members themselves. However, our inquiry indicates that there is much more information needed by the target audiences.

Eastern Area

In the Eastern Area, there was mixed success with respect to achieving awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. Although there had been some presentations of training packets by a Central Office Education Specialist, with these presentations having been well received, there appears to have been limited follow-through. It appears that too much reliance was placed upon Central Office personnel, the developers of the training packet, to the exclusion of additional efforts. There were, however, other apparent reasons for limited dissemination activity. For example, the Miccosukee Tribe had already contracted their schooling system. As a consequence, presentations to the target audiences of the Miccosukee Tribe were felt to be somewhat irrelevant.

One of the more successful efforts in the Eastern Area was felt to be that of the Choctaw Tribe. The Choctaw Tribe had hired its own school planner, who was actively involved in educating target audiences with respect to management options available. While this effort was felt to be commendable, it was felt that the Area Office may have relied too much on this particular effort, to the exclusion of other dissemination efforts.

Muskogee Area

The Muskogee Area appears to have achieved limited dissemination of information regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. It was felt by the research team that the limited success in the Muskogee Area could well

be attributed to a chargeover in personnel at a critical time in the assignment of responsibility regarding dissemination of information about the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. Specifically, there was a changeover of the Area Director and the Assisstant Area Director for Education at approximately the time the dissemination task was levied upon the Muskogee Area. In addition, there appears to have been a reluctance to utilize the training packet, and to introduce the management options in the Muskogee Area. In interviews with the Muskogee Area personnel, it was felt that a philosophical difference regarding the dissemination task existed between the Central Office and the Muskogee Area. Muskogee Area personnel expressed a reluctance to disseminate information regarding management options, since in their estimation, such dissemination might infringe upon independent decision-making of the Indian peoples involved. It appears that the Muskogee Area personnel felt that they had an option as to whether or not to pursue information-dissemination activities addressing the Objective. It perhaps should have been clarified whether or not it is the option of any Area to decide, on its own, to pursue, or not to pursue, information-providing activities with respect to the Presidential/Secretarial Objective.

Evaluation of Overall Strategy and Operating Plan of the Central Office of Indian Education Programs

As noted previously, there was tremendous variation in the four Areas studied, in terms of the success in disseminating information to target audiences regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective. In those Areas where success in disseminating the inforamtion was felt to be minimal, the research team made efforts to determine why such was the case. Success of the operating plan of the Central Office was clearly achieved in some of

the Areas udner study (see individual Areas in the text). In those Areas of high success, praise must be given to the Central Office for the manner in which it levied the task upon these Areas, and followed through with an adequate reporting system. Further, it is a tribute to those Area personnel who, given a demanding task, did indeed fulfill the information-dissemination Objective quite adequately. Suggestions for improving reporting by the Areas to the Central Office, are made below.

Recommendations

First, the individual Areas must specify the the Central Office exactly who at the Area level has been designated as the person responsible for implementation of the dissemination of information required to achieve the Objective. Next, the Areas should clearly specify to the Central Office which, in their particular Area are the priority target audiences to be addressed. Since different pariorities will be assigned, in accordance with the uniqueness of the particular Area, agreement between the Central Office and the Area regarding such prioritization should be clearly specified. The success of the information-dissemination in some of the Areas under study clearly indicates to the research team that the overall strategy and operating plan of the Central Office is viable. If these above recommendations are implemented, then the reporting plan of the Central Office should function smoothly in all the respective Areas.

Survey Data

A survey instrument was developed by the research team and sent to the following target populations: Members of tribal governments, tribal members, BIA school board members, parents of BIA school students, and staff members of BIA schools. (See questionnaire in appendix.) The questionnaire was

developed in order to determine the extent of information regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, on the part of the target audiences named above. In addition, it attempted to determine how such information was obtained, whether or not the information was felt to be sufficient, whether the BIA training packet was utilized, and whether or not the Presidential/Secretarial Objective was felt to be a precursor to termination.

Despite the fact that 685 questionnaires were sent out to the various target audiences, a total of 94 (14%) were returned. The greatest number of returns for a given target audience was 59 questionnaires (from tribal members of several different tribes). For this reason, there can be no assurances that data from the returned questionnaires are necessarily representative of the positions or views of any given target audience. Consequently, information provided via the questionnaires must be considered tentative, and only suggestive of what may be the true feelings and views of the respective target populations.

Questionnaire data are reported below:

Survey Data Summary

Ever heard of Presidential/Secretarial Objective?

	No.	%
YES	34	36
NO	60	64
If "YES", became aware through:		
Area Office Personnel	23	56
Tribal Council	4	9
BIA Publication	6	14

	No.	%
Local News Media	3	7
Indian Community Members	2	5
School Publication	1	2
Tribal Publication	3	7

Can you decide which system you prefer?

YES	23	64
NO	13	36

Were you given a BIA-prepared presentation of tapes, slides, etc.?

YES	14	45
NO	17	55

If "YES", was material explained adequately?

YES	15	60
NO	10	40

Do you agree with the Presidential/Secretarial Objective?

YES	13	57
NO	10	43

Do you think it will lead to termination?

YES	19	59
NO	13	41

Discussion of Survey Data

Data from the returned survey instruments indicate that, of the 94 returned questionnaires, 36% of the respondents had heard of the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective, with 64% indicating that they had not. Of those respondents who indicated that they had heard of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, they indicated that they had been made aware by the following

sources: Area Office personnel, 55%; tribal council, 9%; BIA publication, 14%; local news media, 7%; Indian community members, 5%; school publication, 2%; and tribal publication, 7%. It is evident that the major source of information regarding the Presidential/Secretarial Objective was Area Office personnel. As noted in the survey data summary table, of the eight possible sources of information regarding the Objective, Area Office personnel were cited as the source 55% of the time.

When the respondents were asked if they were in a position to decide which management option system they preferred, 64% felt that they were, with 36% indicating that they were not able to decide their preference.

Of those respondents who indicated an awareness of the Objective, 45% indicated that they had been given BIA-prepared presentations, with 55% indicating that they had not been given a presentation. Of these respondents who had been given the BIA training packet, 60% indicated that the material adequately explained the management options, with 40% indicating that it did not.

Of those respondents who indicated awareness of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, 57% indicated that they were in agreement with the Objective, with 43% indicating that they were not in agreement. When respondents were asked whether implementation of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective would lead to termination, 59% expressed a feeling that it would lead to termination, with 41% feeling that it would not.

Analyses of the survey data generally agree quite closely with the observations made by the research team in the scores of interviews they had conducted in the four Areas under consideration. It was clear to the

research team that, when people were aware of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, it was the Area Office personnel who were the source of information, as opposed to tribal councils or other potential sources. Further, of those who had been given the BIA-prepared training packet, approximately two out of three persons felt that the material contained in the packet explained the management options adequately.

It should be noted that 64% of the respondents indicated that they had sufficient information upon which to make a preference of one of the management options available. It appears that, if a formal presentation is made to members of the target populations, that they do, in fact, obtain sufficient information regarding management options.

When respondents were asked whether or not they were in agreement with the Presidential/Secretarial Objective, only a slight majority (57%) was in agreement. When asked whether the implementation of the Presidential/ Secretarial Objective would lead to termiantion, almost 60% indicated that it would.

Below is a compilation of comments made by questionnaire respondents:

South Dakota - A member of the tribal government stated, "We understand the Flandreau School is not designated as an area of consideration and we do not know why."

Suggestions on how BIA can help get sufficient information about school management options:

1. South Dakota - Thinks people on school boards need to be educated so that the contracted schools don't fall by the way as many have in their area.

2. South Dakota - Training sessions should be conducted on a local basis.
3. South Dakota - Printed information explaining each option would be very helpful.
4. South Dakota - Need more workshops on school board development, eventually would like to see BIA schools function under Indian people.
5. South Dakota - More cooperation.
6. South Dakota - The Bureau is forever imposing deadlines. We had very little time to digest the information, and no time to take it out to the parents.
7. Muskogee - Send someone to the school to meet with the staff and explain the options.
8. Muskogee - Small seminars. Workshops staffed with learned unbiased consultants.
9. Muskogee - Would prefer schools remain as they now are.

Ideas why BIA materials did not explain objective adequately:

1. Muskogee - It was only discussed lightly at a pre-school workshop.
2. South Dakota - The slides were too simplified, they were an insult to the integrity of the tirbal members.
3. South Dakota - The method of disbursing the information could have been presented in a more interesting format.
4. South Dakota - It was very misleading as to the success of the programs that have been initiated.
5. Oklahoma - Too complicated to understand, should be in layman's language.

Muskogee - A tribal member noted, "I believe an individual is entitled to make decisions which involve the future of his welfare."

South Dakota - A tribal member noted, "I believe that Indian Education is a congressional obligation under law and if ever to be dissolved, it should be people's input and consent as the party to the Peace Treaty."

South Dakota - A tribal member stated, "I was on the tribal government from 1970 to 1974 and was Tribal Chairman in 1974. But was asked to resign because there may be a conflict of interest, being that I was a BIA employee.

Appendix

George W. Underwood
dba/ Underwood Research and Evaluation
5963 East 31st Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

A recent policy statement of the United Stated government attempts to encourage Indian people to make decisions for themselves in the area of Indian education. The policy is called the Secretarial/Presidential Objective, and says:

> By the end of fiscal year 1975, or June 30, 1975, at least one-fourth (50) of the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools will operate under the management system chosen by those served by the school. (One management system is to choose to permit the schools to remain as they are now)

In an attempt to fulfill this objective, Area Offices have been making presentations to tribal groups, and, through the tribes, to local communities and school boards, in a attempt to explain the choices of management systems available for Indian schools. Our company has been conducting a study for BIA to determine how successfully the information regarding the above Presidential/Secretarial Objective has been presented to Indian peoples.

Would you please assist us by taking a few minutes of your time and answering the following questionnaire. Your assistance will be of great help to Indian people. Thank you.

Please check one of the following.

I am a:

Member of a tribal government. _____

Member of a tribe. _____

Member of a BIA school board. _____

Parent of a BIA student. _____

Student in a BIA school. _____

Staff member of a BIA school. _____

Have you even heard of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective which was described above?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please return the questionnaire to us in the enclosed envelope. Thank you.

If yes, please check how you became aware of the objective:

Presentation by area office personnel _____

Presentation by tribal council _____

BIA publication _____

Local Media (paper, radio, TV) _____

Members of the Indian community _____

School publication _____

Tribal publication _____

However you got information about the several school management options available, do you feel that you know enough to decide which management system you like best?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, please suggest how BIA could help you get sufficient information about school management options.

_____

_____

_____

If you marked above that you became acquainted with the Objective through a presentation by Area Office personnel or through tribal council members, were you give a BIA-prepared presentation consisting of slides, cassette tapes, and printed materials dealing with the Objective?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please answer the following:

Did you feel that the BIA-prepared materials explained the Presidential Secretarial Objective adequately?

Yes _____ No _____

If No, please explain why.

_____

_____

If Yes, are you in agreement with the aims of the Presidential/Secretarial Objective?

Yes _____ No _____

Do you feel that the Presidential/Secretarial Objective will somehow lead to termination?

Yes _____ No _____

Thank you for your help.